



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

draws largely on investigators such as Dill, Friedländer, Wendland, Deissmann; but he writes almost everywhere with the authority of a scholar, who has examined at least his literary sources at first hand. In all that concerns the more external features of first-century life and society his account leaves little to be desired. We could have wished for a fuller treatment of spiritual and intellectual conditions, e.g., the nature and influence of later Stoicism, the effect of astrological beliefs, the mystical speculations which grew out of the fusion of Eastern and Western ideas. It might have been well, too, if the church had been placed in a more vital relation to its environment. The author proceeds too much on the old assumption that Christianity was an alien movement, triumphing because Providence had secretly arranged a peculiarly favorable set of conditions. Are we not now learning to recognize that in many important respects it was the resultant of the forces at work in the world which it conquered? But within the limits which he has defined for himself Professor Angus is an entirely safe guide. We would commend the book especially to the notice of theological teachers. They will find no more useful textbook for what must now be regarded as an indispensable branch of New Testament study.

E. F. SCOTT

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY
KINGSTON, CANADA

ROBERTSON'S GRAMMAR OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK¹

The first impression made by this book is that of size. For fourteen hundred pages it wends its way through the various highways and bypaths of the grammar of the language of the New Testament. It is a herculean task which Professor Robertson has brought to completion, whether one views it from the standpoint of the mere mechanical work involved or from the standpoint of the more taxing labor of reading and research.

The appearance of so large a book on such a subject is a matter of interest in these days when, to state it mildly, the linguistic discipline no longer retains the firm hold which it once possessed in college and seminary circles. The feeling on the part of many that the heyday of rigid linguistic requirements is past, at least for a time, renders the production of such work as this a matter of some note.

¹ *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research.* By A. T. Robertson. New York: George H. Doran Co., 1914. xl+1,360 pages. \$5.00.

Yet it was time for a new grammar of the Greek of the New Testament to appear. The various translations and revisions of Winer have done heroic service and are still valuable, but new things needed to be said. The failure of Schmiedel to complete the work begun many years ago was a disappointment, and left the need for a new volume insistent. The *Prolegomena* of J. H. Moulton caused New Testament scholars to look wistfully for the completion of the task assumed by that author, but they have looked in vain. It is to the credit of Professor Robertson that by dint of energy and persistence he has completed his task in this field. How much persistence was required may be gathered from the fact that the project was launched twenty-six years ago; how much energy has been devoted to it a perusal of the pages will reveal.

The main justification for the volume, and it is the one on which Dr. Robertson relies, is the progress which has been made in the last generation in certain lines which are of vital importance to the study of the language of the New Testament. The emergence of the study of language as a historical science would in itself have warranted the undertaking of such a task; while the important and almost amazing discoveries regarding the popular language of the Greco-Roman world made such an undertaking imperative. There have been pioneers in this field. The names of Deissmann, Milligan, Moulton, Thumb, and many others arouse feelings of gratitude in those who study and teach in this realm. That Professor Robertson would be indebted to such men was to be expected and he himself makes full and grateful acknowledgment of such indebtedness.

The book is an attempt to re-work the field of New Testament grammar from the standpoint of comparative philology and historical grammar. In an introduction of some one hundred and forty pages the author discusses the new material which in recent years has been placed at the disposal of the grammarian of the New Testament. Comparative grammar, advance in the grammatical and textual fields of the classic Greek authors, and the material of inscriptions, papyri, and ostraca receive due attention. A chapter is devoted to the application of the historical method to grammar, following which the *κοινή* and the relation of the Greek of the New Testament to it are discussed.

Such a survey is desirable in a work of this type and readers will find here within comparatively small space material otherwise widely scattered. The chapter on new material will be helpful to those who have neither time, ability, nor inclination to pursue the matter at first hand. The treatment of the historical method is such as to cause one to wonder

if enough has been done to be of real assistance to those who are not already conversant with much that is there discussed. Should the readers be already familiar with the ground covered, much of the material is unnecessary. The question arises whether it should not be done more thoroughly or not attempted within such limits. To some, however, the summary will be a useful one. In the chapters devoted to the *κοινή* and the relation of the New Testament to it there are some good features. The discussion of the term *κοινή* makes clearer several matters which were probably obscure to some students. The position which the author assumes on Semitic influence in New Testament grammar is sane and well taken.

The rest of the book, with the exception of a few notes and some indexes, is divided between accidence and syntax. The author tries to bear in mind the comparative and historical point of view from which he is writing and he achieves a fair measure of success. In the main the ordinary categories of grammar are followed. Much of the ground covered is old; in the very nature of the case that must be. But many interesting and suggestive features appear in consequence of the new material and the new point of view. The method of approach to the preposition, namely, from its original meaning and its root idea is promising even if it fails at times of consistent pursuit. The discussion of the cases, e.g., the genitive, is instructive and will be found of value. The treatment of the so-called "accusative and infinitive," while admittedly not new with Professor Robertson, should prove of no little assistance to students in seeing more clearly the significance of that construction.

In the process of producing this work the author has made himself familiar with a considerable literature. Many of these volumes are among the best in their field and they have helped to determine the general trend and treatment. Some of these authors Professor Robertson follows closely. Others he treats with a degree of independence; sometimes he is almost cavalier in his treatment of them. In some of the chapters, notably in the early part of the book, one feels that the author's reaction on the works which form the basis of his discussion is not so thorough as one could wish. There is too great a proportion of quotation and too little of the author.

It is a large book. The reviewer would be glad if he were able to say that it was a great book. But, in spite of the time and labor and devotion and enthusiasm which manifestly have gone into its making, it can scarcely be so called. The fault is not with the subject, nor does it inhere in the material at the author's hand. The author himself has

failed to make it a great book. The work is uneven in quality. Perhaps this was to be expected in a volume which had been so long in process of becoming. A more discriminating attitude as to the material which was necessary and relevant would have resulted in a smaller but surely a better book. Both in statement in the text and in reference in the footnotes there is room for improvement in this respect.

In literary matters there is not a little to criticize. Some of the defects may be explained as resulting from the adoption of a colloquial style. But one wonders whether such adoption is permissible in a work of this kind even when discussing colloquial Greek. Other features which deserve criticism are due to loose and careless revision. One does not expect such things in a work which both aims at being and claims to be a scholarly production to be used by educated readers. Fortunately, however, in most of the passages the meaning is fairly clear. But there are cases where it is extremely difficult to ascertain the author's meaning. The following is an aggravated instance: "There is less difference in the syntax of the *κοινή* and that of the earlier Greek than in the forms, though the gradual disappearance of the optative use of *ἴνα* and finite verb in the non-final sense rather than the infinitive or even *ἵνα*, the gradual disuse of the future part, may be mentioned" (p. 64). The reviewer thinks that he knows the thought which the author intended to convey, but the idea was gained only after a reconstruction of the sentence and a careful comparison with other parts of the volume.

It is not only in point of literary style that the book is deserving of criticism. In the discussions there are statements to which many readers will hesitate to give assent, while others will refuse to admit them. The assumption of the bilingualism of Peter and the bilingualism, if not the trilingualism, of Jesus (pp. 28-29) is not the result of careful work. If Peter spoke Greek on the day of Pentecost we should be interested to know what later service Mark rendered him as interpreter. Is the tradition of Papias to be sacrificed on the altar of bilingualism? This part of Dr. Robertson's argument betrays a lack of sympathetic understanding of the problem of Gospel origins. In fact, throughout the volume the author's treatment of questions of introduction to the books of the New Testament is unsatisfactory. It is true that he declares that such problems are not the special concern of the grammarian. One might be content to let it rest there were it not for the fact that the writer of the volume constantly assumes a position on disputed questions and proceeds to argue thereon.

Professor Robertson admits (p. 389) that there are instances "where theological bias will inevitably determine how one interprets the Greek

idiom." Such an admission is not encouraging. There may be some who doubt the inevitability of such a procedure. Be that as it may, there are not wanting occasions when the author cannot be altogether absolved from this fault. The nominative following the preposition ἀπό in Rev. 1:4 is repeatedly given a theological explanation. A theological bias is occasionally seen in the treatment of some prepositions, such as the bold declaration of the telic use of εἰς in the phrase εἰς ἄφθου in Matt. 26:28 and a certain hesitation to admit a similar significance in the same phrase in Mark 1:4 and Acts 2:38 (p. 595). The discussion of ἐνέρι on p. 631 savors a little of special pleading from the theological standpoint especially, in view of a statement on p. 567 concerning this preposition and two others that they approach the subject of the death of Christ from different angles. Surely the grammarian did not require the aid of the theologian in so simple a matter as the significance of the conditional sentence in Luke 4:3. But our author argues the question in so strange a fashion that the argument deserves quotation. "In Luke 4:3, εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ [*sic*], ἐνέρι, we have a good example of the first class condition. The devil would not, of course, use the second class (assumed to be untrue), for that would be an affront to Christ. The third and fourth classes would throw doubt on the point. The temptation, to have force, must be assumed as true. The devil knew it to be true. He accepts that fact as a working hypothesis in the temptation. He is anxious to get Jesus to *prove* it, as if it needed proof for Christ's own satisfaction and for his reception. If the devil used Aramaic, then we have Christ's own translation or that of the evangelist" (p. 1009). One scarcely knows how to meet such *naïveté*. The use of Aramaic by the devil is novel. If Jesus were bilingual, as Professor Robertson holds, what was to hinder the tempter from speaking Greek unless he were linguistically limited to the Semitic tongues? Moreover, the point of the discussion is the significance of the conditional form in Greek. Could the same fine distinctions be expressed by those using the Aramaic language? Elsewhere in the book the author makes a strong statement to the effect that the Greek conditional clauses formed one of the noblest achievements of syntax because of their ability to indicate fine distinctions. Did Aramaic equal Greek in this respect? The foregoing quotation savors of the classroom in one of its lightest and, it is to be hoped, rarest phases.

There are other matters, not theological, that seem to reflect the lecture room in its lighter moods rather than the study of the scholar. One scarcely knows whether Dr. Robertson is humorous or serious in such a statement as the following: "It is hardly worth while to warn the

inept that there is no connection between the article τό and the English *to* in a sentence like Phil. 1:21, ἐμοὶ γὰρ τὸ ζῆν Χριστὸς καὶ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν κέρδος." Surely no one so inept as to need even the slightest reminder on this point would be likely to make much use of such a volume as the one under review. Is it not possible that the author slightly underrates the intelligence of his prospective readers?

In the sphere of grammatical statement and treatment some criticisms must be made. A more thorough discussion of anarthrous nouns with emphasis on the qualitative use is to be desired. At times an element of positiveness appears which is not entirely warranted by the facts. The ὅτι clause of Mark 4:41 is cited as a "very clear" instance of the consecutive use of that word (p. 1001). Some will think that the causal function is the simpler explanation here. At any rate, the case is not "very clear." The relative clause in Matt. 24:2 is better treated as a descriptive relative clause than as consecutive. The infinitive μνησθῆναι in Luke 1:54 expresses purpose rather than result. In fact there is room for improvement in the entire discussion of those clauses which lie on the borderland between final and consecutive functions. A much better example of a conditional clause, determined as unfulfilled, than Mark 6:5 (p. 1013) could have been selected. Is not the use of εἰ μὴ in this instance exceptive rather than conditional? The rejection of the category "attendant circumstance" for the circumstantial participle simply necessitates the extension of the boundaries of other categories, sometimes at the cost of awkwardness.

Perhaps it is too much to expect complete consistency in so large a book written during so long a period. However that may be, we do not always find it. "The Johannine writings reflect the vernacular style very distinctly" (p. 76). "The Gospel and First Epistle [of John] probably had the care and the assistance of cultured friends" (p. 137). On p. 966 while the author is discussing Mark 5:4 the following comment is made: "Burton thinks that here διὰ gives rather the evidence than the reason. Why not both?" On p. 1071 we find the remark: "In Mark 5:4 it is rather the evidence than the reason that is given."

The typographical errors seem to be few. The following were noticed during the reading of the book: "Millegan" for "Milligan" (p. 65), "soonly" for "so only" (p. 252), Ϳ for Ϳ (p. 225). The mechanical work of the book is well done and its execution reflects credit on the publishers.

The author designed this volume "for advanced students in theological schools, for the use of teachers, for scholarly pastors who wish a comprehensive grammar of the Greek New Testament on the desk for

constant use, for all who make a thorough study of the New Testament or who are interested in the study of language, and for libraries." The constituency to which appeal is made is a comprehensive one and doubtless there will be those within its limits who will find occasion to consult the work. When they do so there will be many facts and suggestions which will reward them. These would stand out in bolder relief if a considerable amount of repetition had been avoided and if irrelevant material, possibly the collection of the years devoted to the preparation and making of the book, had been omitted. The volume will serve as a book of reference to be used cautiously and discriminatingly; its magnitude will not favor a widespread use.

ERNEST W. PARSONS

ROCHESTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

LIBERAL ORTHODOXY¹

Dr. Clark in his book of this title undertakes a historico-critical survey of the theological movements, especially in Germany and Great Britain, during the period from the seventeenth century to the present, which have sought to adjust the Christian religion to the intellectual changes of the times. The author's hypothesis is that, in this process of adjustment, liberal orthodoxy, conceiving the essence of Christianity to consist in a system of certain supernaturally given ideas, has tended in one of two directions; on the one hand, desiring to maintain the *residuum* of Christianity, it has drifted toward a formal externalism; while on the other hand, desiring to do justice to changing intellectual movements, it has tended to lose its orthodoxy entirely. This unfortunate "drift" could have been avoided, according to Dr. Clark, through the conception of Christianity as the "life-dynamic" in Christ. Having outlined this hypothesis in his chapter on "The Antecedents," he proceeds to verify it, in the following chapters, through an examination of historical facts.

Dr. Clark finds the forerunners of liberal orthodoxy in the Cambridge school of Platonists represented by Benjamin Whichcot, Henry More, John Smith, and Ralph Cudworth. The movement died out in the early years of the eighteenth century owing to the rise of Deism, but it revived in the first part of the following century. Christianity was forced by the deistic controversy to defend itself in new ways. One of its foremost

¹ *Liberal Orthodoxy*. By Henry W. Clark. New York: Scribner, 1914. xi+313 pages. \$2.00.